



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/726,394	12/01/2000	James F. Loughrey	4502-001	1287

7590 09/10/2002

LOWE HAUPTMAN GILMAN & BERNER, LLP
Suite 310
1700 Diagonal Road
Alexandria, VA 22314

EXAMINER

LEE, WILSON

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2821

DATE MAILED: 09/10/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/726,394

Applicant(s)

James Loughrey

Examiner

Wilson L

Art Unit

2821

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Wilson Lee(3) James Loughrey(2) Don Wong(4) Randy NoranbrockDate of Interview Jul 17, 2002Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conferencec) ☒ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☒ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☒ Yes e) ☐ No. If yes, brief description:

Applicant's invention as shown comprises a number of light bulbs and a manual control means. And it was said there is a cpu control inside the fixture.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-39

Identification of prior art discussed:

Sinha et al. (6,188,181), Recknagel et al. (6,031,343) and Yamazaki et al. (4,388,567)Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

The limitation of the claims "fixture" was discussed mainly. Other limitations such as "choke", "firing circuit", and "silicon-controlled rectifier" were also discussed. Applicant exhibited his invention in the interview. He explained that his invention does not require any firing circuit, choke or silicon-controlled rectifier between the main circuit and the light emitting means.

The arguments addressed by applicant at the meeting are not persuasive. And therefore the rejections on the claims are still maintained.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


Examiner's signature, if required